

July 7, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

15175

that we are examining the contract audit operations of the General Accounting Office and analyzing the issues that have developed. I have good reason to believe that Mr. Campbell and others of his staff consider the hearings beneficial, as does the Department of Defense and Government contractors generally, and that the General Accounting Office will be responsive to our recommendations and will work with us toward the mutual goal of making the General Accounting Office as effective an instrument as possible in carrying out its statutory duties, assisting the Congress, and promoting efficiency and economy in the public service.

I have known Mr. Campbell since 1953 when he was appointed by President Eisenhower as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I have been a member since its inception in 1946, keeps fully informed of the work of the Atomic Energy Commission; and Mr. Campbell had occasion in the past to appear before the Joint Committee. In 1954, I believe, Mr. Campbell was given a recess appointment by President Eisenhower to the post of Comptroller General, and in 1955 he was confirmed for the regular 15-year term, of which he has served better than 10 years.

That same year—1955—I became chairman of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, and during the decade of Mr. Campbell's incumbency our subcommittee has conducted many investigations and held many hearings. We have sought and obtained assistance from the General Accounting Office, when required in connection with our inquiries, and we have received and examined many hundreds of General Accounting Office reports.

I know Mr. Campbell will leave his post, which he has served with great distinction, with the best wishes of many, many people. I have the highest regard personally for Mr. Campbell and I sincerely wish him many happy years of retirement. He has been an outstanding public servant, and has rendered a fine service to the Congress, the executive branch, and the taxpayers of this country.

INEQUITIES IN H.R. 6675

(Mr. MINSHALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, should the Social Security Amendments of 1965 be enacted as now written in H.R. 6675, as many as 18,000 veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war would face reduction or elimination of veterans pension benefits.

Under present law, a veteran who is totally and permanently disabled for reasons not connected to his military service may collect a pension up to \$115 monthly. But his income must not exceed \$1,400 per year if he is unmarried, \$2,700 annually if married. The Veterans' Administration counts 90 percent of any social security benefits he receives as part of that income.

The loss or reduction of these veteran benefits as a result of enactment of H.R. 6675 would more than offset the proposed 7-percent increase in social security payments.

It is my understanding that Senator MILLER, of Nebraska, will today or tomorrow call for an amendment to H.R. 6675, now under debate in the Senate Chamber, to correct this inequity. I wish to introduce identical legislation for immediate consideration by the House in the event that Senator MILLER's efforts are not successful. If they are, and there is no reason to believe they will not be in view of similar action by the Senate last year, I urge House conferees on H.R. 6675 to approve the amendment.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 167 I voted "yea," but I am not listed as voting. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent bound CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be corrected as follows: June 29, 1965, page 14620, first column, last paragraph which starts "New York City alone could use the entire authorization." The figure of 4,200 new public housing units should be changed to read 5,250 new public housing units.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent bound CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be corrected as follows: June 30, 1965, page 14738, first column, the sentence beginning "We know that Nasser has diverted" should be changed to read "We know that Nasser has diverted 40 percent of the United Arab Republic rice crop for export, most of it to the Communist bloc—in violation of previous diplomatic agreement."

(Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. WIDNALL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PORT HUENEME PRAYER DAY ACCORDED NATIONAL RECOGNITION

(Mr. TEAGUE of California (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the mayor and City Council of Port Hueneme in the 13th Congressional District of California, recently proclaimed Thursday, July 1, as a day of

prayer in remembrance of those who have given their lives and those who have suffered wounds in defense of our country.

The proclamation, signed by Mayor Ray D. Prueter, referred particularly to two men from the Port Hueneme Seabee unit who had been killed the week before at Dong Xoai in Vietnam and the six who were wounded in the battle. But the proclamation also gave recognition to "all other servicemen of the United States."

Mayor Prueter and the council asked that all public officials, merchants, businessmen, and citizens join in attending church services of their choice in prayer during the hour from noon to 1 p.m. and that business establishments join the city government in closing during that hour.

The Nation's wire services took appropriate notice of the proclamation in news dispatches, with the result that Mayor Prueter received a great many congratulatory communications from people throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am placing in the RECORD at this point the proclamation and a news article from the Oxnard Press-Courier of June 30 headlined "Nation Responds to Port Day of Prayer":

NATION RESPONDS TO PORT DAY OF PRAYER

(By Murray Norris)

The day of prayer set for tomorrow by Port Hueneme Mayor Ray D. Prueter has caught the heartstrings of the Nation, and persons around the country have written to tell him they will join their prayers with his.

Two weeks ago Prueter set July 1 as a day of prayer for Port Hueneme. He will close city offices for an hour tomorrow and has called on businessmen to close their stores and attend church to pray for peace and servicemen who are giving their lives in Vietnam.

At the time he made the prayer proclamation, Prueter had in mind the two men from the Port Hueneme Seabee base who had been killed at Dong Xoai in Vietnam the week before, and the six that were wounded in the Dong Xoai battle. He recalled that President Abraham Lincoln had proclaimed days of fast, prayer and humiliation during the Civil War, and asked his city to join in emulating this practice.

MESSAGES

Since that time, he has received 50 congratulatory telephone calls, a score of letters from all parts of the Nation, and more than 50 requests for copies of the proclamation, including one from a city councilman in San Luis Obispo County.

One letter which the mayor received from Tulsa, Okla., said:

"One of the Seabees wounded in the recent battle at Dong Xoai was our brother * * * we will join you on July 1 in prayer for those wounded and for the families and loved ones of those who bravely gave their lives in Vietnam. * * *

KIN WRITES

"Would to God that we were all worthy of the sacrifices made for us."

It was signed "The Seven Brothers and Sisters of John R. McCully."

Prueter said the letters have been coming in rather slowly due to "being routed through the Oxnard City Hall." This is because a story circulated by United Press International identified Prueter as the "mayor of Oxnard."

15176

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 7, 1965

"One of the letters we received this morning was from a Jewish synagogue," said the Port Hueneme mayor. "The proclamation appeals to people of all faiths."

AT BASE CHAPEL

Tomorrow at noon, Prueter along with his family and other members of the Port Hueneme City Council will attend services at the Seabee base chapel between noon and 1 p.m. Through the cooperation of the Port Hueneme-Oxnard Ministerial Council, the Community Presbyterian Church will hold services in Port Hueneme, and the All-Saints Episcopal Church will hold services in Port Hueneme, and the All-Saints Episcopal Church will hold services in Oxnard.

Prueter said he was closing the Port Hueneme city offices as a gesture of sacrifice to join with the prayers of the citizens to "implore God's clemency and forgiveness."

Robert Howlett, mayor of Oxnard, has issued a proclamation calling for prayers during the noon hour as has Ventura County Executive Loren Enoch. Neither of these governmental agencies will close their offices, however.

ALMOST A PRAYER

The wording of Prueter's proclamation was considered almost a prayer by several ministers, and it will be read as a part of the prayer services in both Port Hueneme and Oxnard tomorrow.

In a letter from Atlanta, Ga., Mrs. Nellie L. Gaudry praised the mayor saying, "I am very proud we still have men like you that believe in God and prayer in these troubled, war-torn times * * *."

Mrs. Margie Caposela, of Cincinnati, Ohio, said, "Your town must be quite proud of you * * *."

A college student in San Antonio, Tex., complimented the mayor for his "pause in the rush of modern living to remember Almighty God and to attribute to Him the homage due. I am convinced that if this practice were more common, our poor world and its inhabitants would be much closer to God and, consequently, closer to all that God is—peace and love."

MOST PROFOUND

Even a former World War II Seabee, Michael Miranda, of New York, who shipped out of Port Hueneme, wrote to say he would add his prayers to those of others on July 1.

One letter from Philadelphia contained only a newspaper clipping about the day of prayer and a Christmas card.

"The meaning of this letter was most profound," said Prueter.

But perhaps letters that touch the mayor most deeply are those like the one he received from a 92-year-old widow, which said: "I asked in my church last Sunday if everyone would join in prayer July 1 when you in Oxnard pray * * *. I wish that the mayors in every city in the United States would see the need of praying to God these days."

A LOSS TO THE NAVY

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Defense, I learned to appreciate the service rendered by Ken Belieu to the Department of Defense and to his country.

I share the sentiments expressed in the July 1 editorial in the New York Times entitled "A Loss to the Navy." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that editorial:

A LOSS TO THE NAVY

The departure of Kenneth E. Belieu from Government service today is a loss to the administration, and—more specifically—to the Navy.

Mr. Belieu, who served President Kennedy and President Johnson for 4½ years as Assistant Secretary and then Under Secretary of the Navy, was, first of all, qualified by experience. He served with the Army in Europe in World War II and was wounded and decorated; later he lost a foot in Korea, and retired with the rank of colonel. He had the moral courage, while still on active duty, to oppose Senator McCarthy in open hearings when McCarthy was attacking the Army in 1954. He was staff director of two Senate committees headed by the then Senator Johnson.

In his service in the Pentagon he was known primarily for three qualities. He understands people, realizing that they are the heart of any military service. He was not afraid to speak his mind and to argue for what he believes. He knows Washington as a political entity and he respects the respective roles of the executive and the legislative branches of Government.

The Navy will remember him with affection—most of all those Navy amputees, hurt in an aircraft carrier accident, who were roused out of deep depression when Mr. Belieu, in a visit to their hospital, sat down on the edge of a bed, took off his artificial leg and held it up to show them that their lives had not ended.

A ONE-MAN TOWN

(Mr. HALL (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the June 25 edition of the Washington Post contained a very good column by Mr. Patrick O'Donovan.

The article, more than anything else I have read, illustrates the rigor mortis which has taken hold over our political process.

Surely, Mr. O'Donovan's words should be a cause of concern to every Member of this House and to all who wish to preserve a representative form of government.

The article follows:

A ONE-MAN TOWN: WASHINGTON UNDER L.B.J.
(By Patrick O'Donovan)

The pleasure of reporting on this city used to be its complication. American politics is an art form that grows more fascinating the deeper you penetrate. A serious man could spend his life in a delighted study of this most sophisticated and extravagant system.

There was the subtle interplay of White House and Capitol. Occasionally there was a great gun fired from the Supreme Court to put everyone back on the starting line. There were lobbies and pressure groups crowding the executive and the legislature. There were the great figures, Senators, Governors, or mayors, playing the role that was given to kingmakers or white-haired councilors in Europe.

Even when it was boring it was subtle. The interplay of powerful, squalid, great, and good men fighting to get their way was a spectacle that commanded a decent attention. The working of a democracy, with all its mechanism—good and bad—exposed, this was a privilege to watch. And suddenly all this hubbub is stilled.

This has become a one-man town. It is partly because President Johnson is so ef-

fective, partly because there is no rival on any horizon. There is his brilliant parliamentary performance on the domestic scene, the fact that he has completed a program designed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt that up to now had been blocked by political maneuvering.

And there remains the fact that this man, who is above all a domestic politician, is faced with the foreign problem that is more intimately terrible than any that has faced the United States before. And this is a democracy that is not geared to discuss problems of foreign policy. When these arise, the tradition is that the country speaks with a single voice. And the voice today is Mr. Johnson's.

Washington is like an unwatered lawn that is dying from the roots. You can see it in the newspapers. The great reporters have nothing to report. The columnists have either to ratiocinate or else to write on trivial subjects.

It is true the columnists continue to lay down the law in a manner not seen in the British press. It is also true that they are indulging themselves in a sort of intramural controversy. Joseph Alsop, a perfervid defender of the Administration, attacks his enemies as "twaddle merchants," and his opponents talk of the "house-trained" correspondents. It is fun, but it is not the real thing.

And all this time there is this astonishing, ominous silence from the great doomed, law-making temple that is set above Washington. The liberal Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, Democratic or Republican, simply do not know what to do. Very, very few of them are happy.

But a silence has been imposed upon Washington.

Once upon a time the White House aids were courtiers, were powers and dominions in their own right. They used to talk and gossip and feed the press in the friendly and enthusiastic service of their master. Now it is more than a man's career is worth for any of these men to say anything to a reporter that matters.

All the talk is about the President. And there is little enough of that. Great and good and responsible politicians simply appear to opt out of one aspect of their public life. They are not frightened. This is not McCartyism, but suddenly the democratic process, under a most democratic President, seems to have shuddered to a halt.

It would be quite unfair to blame President Johnson. He is intolerant, occasionally angry and demanding of agreement. He has at his disposal the greatest and best prepared forces that any free country has ever produced in time of peace, and now, in Washington, it is perfectly plain that he and he alone will make the decision on how these forces will be used.

Washington, for the only time in its history, has become a one-man city and all the ministers and advisers who surround him are only his servants.

LET'S GET THE RECORD STRAIGHT

(Mr. BATTIN (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1965, an NBC network television program, "Situation Report," dealt with the debate that is going on in the Congress about our Government's policies in Vietnam. NBC news correspondent Robert Goraliski was the commentator.

During the course of this program, the following unfortunately inaccurate

July 7, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

15177

statement was made concerning the position of the gentleman from Wisconsin, the distinguished chairman of the Republican conference [Mr. LAIRD]:

The truth seems to be that the consensus the President wants is falling apart * * * with the right and left taking issue with the President. Oregon's loquacious Senator Morse represents one extreme—a small congressional minority that would withdraw from Vietnam immediately * * * but leaving the United Nations behind to pick up what pieces might be left. At the other extreme are those represented by MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, and JAMES UTT, of California. These Congressmen are willing to see what's going to happen in the next few months * * * and then lead a campaign to extend the war. Given their way, the United States would pour combat troops into South Vietnam's jungles and planes would destroy everything in sight north of the 17th parallel, including Hanoi itself.

Mr. Speaker, to imply that the gentleman from Wisconsin favors "pouring combat troops into South Vietnam's jungles" is to state a position that is the direct opposite of everything the gentleman from Wisconsin, or the Republican House leadership for that matter, has discussed in recent weeks.

So there will be no mistake about the position of the gentleman from Wisconsin, I include the statement of June 14 by Mr. LAIRD on the subject of Vietnam in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE MELVIN R. LAIRD, OF WISCONSIN, JUNE 14, 1965

We may be dangerously close to ending any Republican support of our present Vietnam policy. This possibility exists because the American people do not know how far the administration is prepared to go with large-scale use of ground forces in order to save face in Vietnam.

The American people deserve an answer to this question. The Republican Party should base its future support on the nature of that answer.

In the absence of this answer, we can only conclude that present policy is aimed not at victory over the Communist insurgency nor at driving Communists out of South Vietnam but rather at some sort of negotiated settlement which would include Communist elements in a coalition government.

If such is the objective of the Johnson administration, then the charge can be leveled that this administration is overcommitting ground forces in this area of the world and needlessly exposing the lives of thousands of American boys.

In several public utterances, administration spokesmen have implied that the ground force buildup in Vietnam is Eisenhower or Republican policy. Such an implication is just the opposite of the truth.

The Eisenhower-Dulles policy scrupulously avoided a large-scale use of conventional ground forces in southeast Asia. As a matter of fact, at the time President Eisenhower left office, there were only 773 members of the U.S. military mission in Vietnam and the situation at that time was much less critical than it is now although we have more than 50,000 American troops there today. Indications are that the American troop buildup in Vietnam could go as high as 100,000 American boys.

Well over 2 years ago, interested free world Asian countries offered to assist U.S. efforts in that area of the world. This aid included the offer of ground troops and other assistance from such countries as South Korea, Formosa, and Thailand. This aid was rejected by the United States at that time.

Today, thousands of American boys are fighting a war and many are losing their lives because the U.S. Government has failed on occasion after occasion to make the right decision at the right time.

If our objective is a negotiated settlement, it is time to use other means than the needless sacrifice of American lives to attain that objective. Once American troops are committed in any situation, a top priority objective must be to take those steps necessary to protect American lives and minimize the number of casualties.

One such step, already long overdue, is to retarget our bombing raids on more significant targets in North Vietnam. A major transportation and supply area is the port city of Haiphong. To continue to allow the unhindered flow of war materials in and out of that area only insures greater American casualties in future Vietcong offensive sections.

Republicans will continue to support President Johnson when his actions in the Vietnamese situation serve American and free world interests and when they do not needlessly waste or endanger American lives.

Mr. Speaker, it is doubly surprising that an NBC news correspondent would err on the position of the gentleman from Wisconsin since his position was restated in a nationally televised interview on the NBC "Today Show" just 3 days after the June 14 statement. Under unanimous consent, I ask that the "Today Show" interview of June 17 with NBC news correspondent Sander Vanocur be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks together with the full transcript of Mr. Goralski's "Situation Report of July 1, 1965."

The House leadership, Mr. Speaker, has spoken with one voice insofar as our policies in Vietnam are concerned. The distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], issued a statement last Thursday, the same day on which Mr. Goralski delivered his "Situation Report." Under unanimous consent, I include the statement by Mr. FORD of July 1, 1965, in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, it will be apparent to anyone reading over the material I have included in the RECORD that the statement by Mr. Goralski was in error and that that error should be corrected. If it is corrected in a subsequent "Situation Report," I would be more than happy to read it into the RECORD as well.

The material referred to follows:

CONGRESSMAN MELVIN LAIRD IS INTERVIEWED

HUGH DOWNS. In Washington, Congressman MELVIN LAIRD, chairman of the Republican conference in the House, said that he doubts the wisdom of giving full Republican support with no questions asked, to President Johnson's Vietnam policy. LAIRD suggests the Republicans should come up with their own policy for Vietnam, rather than following the administration down the line.

Congressman LAIRD is in our Washington studios this morning with "Today" program's Washington correspondent, Sander Vanocur. Gentleman:

(Congressman MELVIN LAIRD and Sander Vanocur are seen on TV screen, seated in studio.)

VANOCUR. Good morning, Hugh. Congressman LAIRD, why have you come to this position now where you suggest that the Republicans who have supported the President on Vietnam are now, as you put it, perilously close to giving up that support?

CONGRESSMAN LAIRD. Well, Sander, I'd just like to say that we in the Republican Party in the House of Representatives I think have gone the extra step to support the President of the United States as far as the southeast Asia war is concerned. GERRY FORD, LES ARENDS, myself, and the other leaders of the House of Representatives on the minority side, have always gone the extra step to support the President of the United States, and we still support the firm action of the President in Vietnam. There are serious questions, however, as to whether we are fighting the proper kind of war, and there are questions about the future, and I believe that we in the minority party have a responsibility and duty to address to the President of the United States, and discuss from one end of this country to the other.

The President chose, back late last year, to escalate the war as he has done to the use of bombing raids to the north, using air power. Now, the President is choosing to escalate the war on the ground in Vietnam. Personally, I think that this is the poorest choice of escalation that the President could possibly make, because we are choosing the very area where the Red Chinese, whom we are confronted with, and we have a confrontation with them in southeast Asia at the present time, are the strongest. And to imply that this is the policy of the former Republican administration, as a high administration spokesman did this past week, to accelerate and to escalate the ground war in Vietnam, is not the case, because the Eisenhower-Dulles policy was just the opposite, that we should not tie down large-scale ground forces in southeast Asia.

VANOCUR. Well, Congressman LAIRD, your statement of Monday seemed to suggest that the administration was remiss in not seeking total victory. Do you believe there is such a thing as total victory in that kind of a war?

LAIRD. Well, first I'd like to say that there were three alternatives available to the United States prior to the Baltimore speech of the President. One of them was military victory, the win policy that Secretary McNamara outlined to the Defense Appropriations Committee on which I serve, in March. And this was the objective and the policy of the United States in March in the testimony of the Secretary of Defense.

VANOCUR. May I interrupt you just a second?

LAIRD. Yes.

VANOCUR. Did he say in that testimony that the United States could win the war?

LAIRD. Yes, and that was the objective of the United States in southeast Asia and Vietnam. The second alternative, of course, was a negotiated settlement, and the third alternative was to withdraw. But after the Baltimore speech of President Johnson, in which he said our objective was to negotiate a settlement, he gave that implied implication to the world that that was our objective as far as Vietnam was concerned, then there were only two alternatives left to us: a negotiated settlement or withdrawal. You cannot talk about military victory in Vietnam when you already have established your policy objective as a negotiated settlement, and this is the objective now of the administration, if they have an objective. It seems to me that they have not been fair with the American people, or fair with even those of us in Congress, by not clearly setting forth their short-term aims, and long-term objectives as far as Vietnam is concerned.

VANOCUR. What would be the aims of a Republican administration; what would be your aims in Vietnam?

LAIRD. Well, I personally think that we cannot go back on the established policy set forth by the President of the United States as far as his Baltimore speech is concerned.

15178

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 7, 1965

So we cannot repudiate this position that has been taken by the leader of our country, and I do not want to be in a position at any time where I will cause the Red Chinese or the Soviet Union to miscalculate the intentions of the United States of America to defend freedom throughout the world. Now, our objective as stated by the President in his Baltimore speech now is for a negotiated settlement. It seems to me that the North Vietnamese are not interested in negotiations today, because they feel that they are winning the war. Now if we choose, as the President has chosen, to escalate the war along the ground, I believe we are choosing the area in which the North Vietnamese and the Red Chinese are the strongest, and I do not feel that that is the best way to bring about this objective that has been set forth by the President. Since the President decided to escalate the war in the air back late last year, we have not hit any significant military targets in North Vietnam. We have gotten the criticism throughout the world for our bombing raids that we knew we would get, and we expect this from certain quarters, but we have not hit any significant military targets. We have allowed the Soviet Union to bring military personnel into North Vietnam to establish SAM sites; we have the Haiphong port in which large-scale military shipments are coming in at this very time, and we have not done anything about stopping these particular shipments, either by a sea blockade of this particular port or by using any of the raids to knock out this very great movement of military supplies and equipment.

VANOCUR. But let's be candid. Doesn't this put you in a very enviable position for 1966, that if the war escalates on the ground, you can say, "We in the Republican Party were against escalating the war, we didn't want American boys killed, and yet we were firmer than President Johnson about opposing the North Vietnamese?"

LAIRD. Well, first I'd like to say that when I talk about these matters I'm speaking as a member, a minority member, of the Defense Appropriations Committee. I do not know what the policy of my party will be in 1966's political campaign as far as this is concerned. But I'm sure that Republicans will be responsible in this area; they will put their country first and their party second, regardless of how that affects the political election. But I believe that discussion and dissent is important today in this area of foreign policy, particularly as we go forward and set future policies as far as it affects southeast Asia.

VANOCUR. Now, what does this do to your position vis-a-vis the Senate Republican block. Now, is Senator DRAXEN following the policies which you have advocated, have you discussed them with him?

LAIRD. I do not believe that there is any difference between my position and that of a majority of the Republicans in the House and in the U.S. Senate. I know that I talked with my leader in the House of Representatives, Congressman GERRY FORD, who's doing an outstanding job as our new leader in the House of Representatives, and there is no disagreement between Congressman FORD and myself. As a matter of fact, we work together in this particular area, and I have been in constant touch with Congressman FORD. Today we're filing the Defense appropriation report on the appropriation bill for 1966. We do not feel that the administration has faced up to its responsibilities even in this area. They have cut back on the amount of Defense requests, money requested for fiscal year 1966, so they could fund some other programs and come in with a budget under \$100 billion. I know, as a member of this committee, that they'll have to come with supplemental appropriations during this year, to fund this Vietnam situation. They've already had to

come with one for \$700 million in 1965. They will have to come after January for further supplemental requests. They got the public reaction of a budget under \$100 billion, they knew that Congress couldn't refuse to give them the funds to carry on the Vietnam war and we will give them these funds. But I think the American people should be advised of the fact that these supplemental requests for defense expenditures are forthcoming and the \$100 billion budget figure was really a phoney when it was submitted in January.

VANOCUR. Congressman, at what point will the Republican Party in Congress, at what point in commitment of men to Vietnam, do you think the Republican Party will say, we can no longer support this? Will this eventually come to pass?

LAIRD. Well, this is a very difficult question, Sander, to answer, because when it comes to the point, now is the time to question the commitment of ground forces in South Vietnam. I do not believe we want to be in a position if the President goes forward and commits several hundred thousand men to Vietnam—and it looks now like we're already programming a hundred thousand men there—I do not believe we want to be in the position at any time to cause any miscalculation on the part of the Soviet Union or the Red Chinese as to the intentions of the United States of America. This is important. So, to give you a time element in this area, I think it would be a grave mistake, as far as I'm concerned.

VANOCUR. Thank you very much, Congressman MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, a very powerful member of the House Republican group.

SITUATION REPORT, JULY 1

(By Robert Goralski)

Party labels don't seem to mean very much in Congress when it comes to Vietnam. It's reached a point where you need a scorecard. And it's a good bet that President Johnson has one.

Republican and Democratic leaders on Capitol Hill are joined in an unusual debate. Both sides say they support the President on Vietnam. . . . It's the other party that's destroying the spirit of bipartisanship. House Minority Leader Ford today went so far as to warn the President that it would be disastrous if he listened to the advice being proffered by some of his own Democrats. This was in answer to Senate Majority leader Mansfield's statement of yesterday that Republicans are doing the country . . . a disservice by calling for an even greater military involvement in Vietnam. Senator MANSFIELD likened some elements of the GOP to Genghis Khan.

The truth seems to be that the consensus the President wants is falling apart . . . with the right and left taking issue with the President. Oregon's loquacious Senator MORSE represents one extreme—a small congressional minority that would withdraw from Vietnam immediately . . . but leaving the United Nations behind to pick up what pieces might be left. At the other extreme are those represented by MELVIN LAIRD of Wisconsin, and JAMES URR of Wisconsin. These Congressmen are willing to see what's going to happen in the next few months . . . and then lead a campaign to extend the war. Given their way, the United States would pour combat troops into South Vietnam's jungles and planes would destroy everything in sight north of the 17th parallel, including Hanoi itself.

Then there are elements slightly more moderate . . . but who still sense that things aren't working out too well . . . and feel something has to be done. They're not sure what.

With expressions of discontent from the Hill, the President can't be too happy. He'd

prefer the kind of bipartisanship that Franklin Roosevelt enjoyed during World War II. If President Roosevelt had his Arthur Vandenberg, then Mr. Johnson has his EVERETT DRAXEN. Both Republicans could approve the actions of the Democrat in the White House.

Consensus—bipartisanship, call what you will, is desirable . . . but then so is honest debate. And the President's policies in Vietnam have received more approval than criticism.

One affect of the extremist talk is to put Mr. Johnson in the position of moderation, where he always feels comfortable. Those who would regard him as impetuous need only look at the saber-rattlers for real impetuosity. Those who think him too willing to pull out need only look at the peace-at-any-price appeals for real pacifism.

But with reports of new setbacks in Vietnam, the two extremes will become more vocal and grow in numbers . . . and the President will have to come up with more answers.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, REPUBLICAN LEADER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON VIETNAM, JULY 1, 1965

Republicans will continue to disregard partisan considerations in foreign policy. We will be guided by the national interest.

Like Senator Arthur Vandenberg at the time of the Yalta agreement, we will criticize administration policy when it fails to serve the national interest. We will make constructive recommendations that will bolster the President's firmness. No Republican has called this McNamara's war.

Several House Republicans, including myself, recently made the following points about Vietnam:

1. The objectives of our Nation's policy must be the establishment of conditions under which the people of South Vietnam may live in peace and freedom. This means a government of their own choosing. This means freedom from aggression—from within and from without.
2. We hope for negotiations to end the fighting—to assure the freedom and independence of South Vietnam. Let me clarify one point—the Communists are escalating the war. No American is. Moreover, Peiping and Hanoi spurn the negotiating table.
3. The United States cannot, without violating its word, agree to settlement which involves a coalition government with Communists. Such government makes a larger war inevitable at a later date. History proves a coalition government with Communists gives them unlimited veto power. Veto power scuttles any hope for permanent peace.
4. The administration must not sacrifice the freedom and independence of South Vietnam. To do so makes the loss of American lives purposeless. Some Democrats would abandon the free people of South Vietnam. The President must not yield to them.
5. In this crisis, some Republican leaders believe American air and sea power must be used more effectively in North Vietnam against significant military targets. We advocate greater allied participation. We question the logic of committing U.S. ground forces on a large scale to fight a war in southeast Asia.

(Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BRAY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Taken all together, the net value of our holdings of property amounts to approximately \$137,622.64 plus the \$32,399.60 credited to my account. Our total assets therefore amount to approximately \$170,022.24, not counting the value of furniture, books, and works of art or the withdrawal value of my senatorial pension rights. These holdings have been accumulated through lifelong savings and small inheritances. They were increased this year by \$7,022.24 because of capital gains, an increase in the price of stocks, and a reduction in the mortgage on our home.

These are the salient facts about our income and holdings as I have been able to compile them. I have had thermofaxed copies made of my income tax statement for 1964, and these are open for inspection at my office.

I report these facts neither to complain about the real income of a Senator nor to justify the recently enacted pay increase for Members of the House and Senate which I opposed and voted against. Speaking for myself, the salary paid to Senators is fair and adequate if one is able and willing to live a modest personal life.

I believe that the people who elected me have a right to know these facts. Primarily, the disclosure of a Congressman's income and assets is the best assurance possible to the people that their representatives are not engaging in possible conflicts of interest. Others apparently do not feel this way and I want it to be clear that my own report is not intended to press on others my personal views concerning disclosure.

NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POZNAN UPRISING

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, June 27 marked the ninth anniversary of the Poznan revolt which occurred in Poland in 1956. It was on that day that a large group of students revolted against their heavy Communist oppression, and demanded the restoration of some of the basic freedoms that Poland had once known, but had lost when the arm of communism overswept that country. It is difficult for those of us who have never suffered a major loss of liberty to realize the hardships involved in shipping away each bit of freedom, under a regime saturated with Soviet troops and surrounded on all sides by Soviet armies.

When Poznan was completely surrounded by troops armed even with heavy tanks, the Polish rebels bravely resisted; and their resistance may be considered successful, in that the Gomulka regime was compelled to grant a greater degree of freedom to the nation; it was forced to recognize that although farmland nationalization might be tolerated in neighboring countries, the Polish farmer would never tolerate nationalization of his land; and it was forced to recognize, as demonstrated by the case of Cardinal Wyszynski, that religious freedom in Poland can never be revoked. As a direct result of that revolt, a series of reforms was instituted. Perhaps those reforms seem slight to us; but they repre-

sented a major break in the Communist cloud of oppression.

In the past 9 years we have witnessed, in the Polish Government, further changes allowing the Polish people to regain some of their lost freedoms. But their fight continues. So, on this day, we pause to honor the rebels of 9 years ago, and to pay tribute to their continuing cause.

THE DILEMMAS WHICH U.S. POLICY FACES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, an editorial in the Baltimore Sun has well explained the cruel dilemmas which U.S. policy faces in southeast Asia. On the one hand, we want to continue the quest for peace. We want to build upon the nuclear test ban treaty, the hot-line agreement, and other agreements that have been made with the Soviet Union.

On the other hand, we know that one essential ingredient in our search for peace is our willingness and determination to resist aggression. We are aware that a détente in the cold war is possible only if the Communists know that there is nothing to be gained by war.

President Johnson has tread a careful path between the two horns of this dilemma. He has clearly demonstrated, by word and deed, the determination of the United States to resist aggression. He has also told the world that we have no desire to terminate the quest for peace. While it is difficult to continue the progress toward peace that we have been making with the Russians, at the same time that we are fighting in Vietnam, the President has repeatedly made clear that he wants to try.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Baltimore Sun of June 7 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DOOR IS OPEN

The President, as noted by Philip Potter in the Sunday Sun, has consistently interwoven two major themes in his recent public utterances on foreign affairs. One theme is the determination to defend freedom and resist aggression; the other is to continue the pursuit of world peace and especially to continue to seek the cooperation of the Soviet Union toward that end. These are not new themes by any means. They have been the central and consistent purposes of the Johnson administration.

The significant thing about the President's restatements of them in his speeches of the past few weeks has been the way he has given them equal emphasis and linked them as inseparable twin aspects of the country's policy. In stressing their connection he has directed his remarks to Moscow and the United States allies as well as the American public. In the words of an aid, quoted by Mr. Potter, the President has been telling Russia "that an overall struggle between us and the Russians is nonsense, and the Russians stand to lose a great deal by it. We are not going to be pushed out of Vietnam. There is no real reason why Russia should undertake such an attempt. There is no real quarrel between our people."

Mr. Johnson returned to this theme in his commencement address at Catholic University yesterday. "War," he said, "serves no necessary end of any nation on earth" but

"peace is still a stranger knocking on the door." The United States is "ready to open that door" and this "is a moment when the opportunity is . . . beckoning for men of all nations to take a walk together toward peace." He made it clear, moreover, that this "invitation," as he called it, was being extended "to the people—and the leaders—of the Communist countries, to the Soviet Union, to nations of Eastern and Western Europe and southeast Asia."

What Mr. Johnson has in mind is in no way difficult to grasp. He is thinking of the progress, slow and piecemeal but encouraging, that has been made in 1963 and 1964 in the direction of better understanding with Russia, the gradual relief of tensions and improvement of relations. He is thinking also of the growing uncertainties which in the past few months have attended Moscow's policy particularly in respect of southeast Asia. The present situation was described by the London Economist: "There are a lot of sensible people who agree that the West should put up a fight in Vietnam but are worried about the effect this will have on the hopes of a stable relationship between the West and Russia. This is a reasonable worry; in preparing for the world of 1975, when China will have nuclear missiles and will not yet have run out of revolutionary steam, it ought to be a major aim of Western policy to keep Russia neutral or, even better, to enroll it in the attempt to contain China. Mr. Johnson would greatly increase the support he gets if he spelled out the connection between his Vietnam policy and his policy toward what we call, for want of a better single word, coexistence."

Latterly the President has been doing just that. Our commitments are to defense and they will not be abandoned; "we want no part of any appeasement or of any aggression." But there is no commitment to militarism any more than there is to isolation. We "invite peace to enter" the troubled, divided world and welcome all joint efforts which have that in view. It is a firm bid to Moscow to resume the efforts to keep the doors open and to use its influence against the closing of them by any nation.

TRIBUTE TO LAWRENCE KNOWLES AND OTHER PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the original Peace Corps authorization legislation and one who believes most strongly in this type of program, I have followed as closely as possible the course of the Peace Corps volunteers from my State in their endeavors. I have recently been informed that Lawrence Knowles, a Peace Corps volunteer, and the son of Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence G. Knowles, of 25 Barbary Hill, Providence, R.I., who presently is a faculty member at the College of Business Administration at the Haile Selassie I University in Ethiopia, has been commended, editorially, in the college newspaper, Busi-Body.

Mr. Knowles, who is 26 years of age, has a B.S. degree in mathematics from Harvard, and in 1963 received a degree of Master of Business Administration from the University of Virginia.

The College of Business Administration in Addis Ababa was started in 1963, and then had only 12 full-time faculty members, 8 of whom were Peace Corps volunteers. During 1964, there were 210 full-time students, with 13 faculty members, 9 of whom were volunteers. Mr.

July 7, 1965

15216

Knowles has been teaching business management and accounting.

I am informed that the local people were very skeptical at the beginning of this program. Now, however, it should be obvious from the editorial in the student newspaper that this situation has radically changed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial captioned "The Pioneers Leave," from the Busi-Body. I note with great pleasure the statement that the Peace Corps volunteers have made a truly practical contribution to better international understanding. To these students, they have demonstrated both their love of hard work and their unrelenting self-sacrificing missionary spirit.

I am informed that at this time the local business community thinks most highly of this College of Business Administration, and is most pleased with the faculty and the graduates. My fellow Rhode Islander, Lawrence Knowles, is one of thousands of dedicated Peace Corps volunteers who have served as ambassadors of good will throughout the underdeveloped world, for in his mission he has brought to the college wisdom and understanding.

I am sure that the praise received from the Ethiopian student body and the community is far more meaningful to Mr. Knowles than any that I or other Senators could lavish on him from the Senate floor. However, these Peace Corps volunteers have given so much of themselves, that I think all Americans owe them a great debt of gratitude.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PIONEERS LEAVE

The end of the current academic year marks the departure of six faculty members and a secretary—all Peace Corps volunteers—from the College of Business. In all school-teachers come and go; there is nothing unusual about that. But this is a special case.

The names of Kreuser, Bayorek, Cordasco, Sprague, Tener, Tracy, Knowles and Rachut will always be remembered in the history of CBA. Without their presence here, the creation of the college in October 1963, would have been difficult, if not impossible, due to the lack of teachers. Their contribution to getting the college started is remarkable, especially in view of the difficult conditions under which they had to work. At the time the college opened, there was a shortage of almost everything: suitable classrooms, books, equipment, etc., but they made the best of what was available.

The significance of the work of this dynamic force lies in these two things. In the first place, they have shown that a good lecturer need not be a hunch-backed, grey-haired old man. Though most of them are relatively young, yet their lectures, characterized by careful and thorough preparation, and methodical presentation, have generally been of very high standard. Furthermore, they have shown that an ideal teacher is not required to play the role of a boss all the time. They always maintained a smiling face to all the students even on occasions when this was difficult.

We the students of CBA have got much to learn from these people. Briefly, they have taught us the love for hardwork—hardwork for its own sake. Also, their self-sacrificing missionary spirit should not go unnoticed.

Their stay here has been a true practical contribution toward better international understanding, often on people's lips but rarely translated into action. Again, accept our inadequate word of thanks. We wish you the best of luck, success, and prosperity in all your future endeavors.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONDALE ON CONTINUED SUPPORT OF NATIONWIDE CONSERVATION EFFORTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the importance of providing continued support of our conservation efforts throughout the country should be of primary concern to every Member of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that my statement before the Subcommittee on Agriculture, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONDALE BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, JUNE 10, 1965

Mr. Chairman, the recent heavy floods in Minnesota and elsewhere in the Mississippi Valley have been a tragic reminder to all of us that the uncontrolled forces of nature can do incredible damage. There is one agency of the Federal Government whose particular function has been to control and harness these potentially destructive forces of nature. For 30 years, the Soil Conservation Service has worked to make nature work for the good of man—and not for evil purposes.

This committee has before it the budget estimates for fiscal 1966 which, I believe, do not give adequate consideration to some of the urgent requirements for soil and water conservation in the United States. I know the committee is well aware of the highly controversial proposal to establish a revolving user fee fund for soil and water conservation practices. I wish to be on record as firmly opposed to the \$20 million reduction in appropriations for conservation operations and to the substitution of user fees levied upon farmers.

I oppose this proposal because it denies an established policy that for 30 years has benefited all the people through sound soil and water conservation practices. Many of these advances could not have been made if individual farmers had been expected to pay for the technical services provided by the Soil Conservation Service. Landowners and operators should not be expected to bear alone the financial burden of conserving natural resources, where these measures benefit the public at large and future generations on the land and in urban areas.

I respectfully urge that this committee reject the Budget Bureau's proposal as a backward step that would prove costly to the Nation. I wish to join with my distinguished colleagues in the Senate who strongly support an increase in appropriations to permit more SCS technical assistance in support of local conservation endeavors. I want to see that program strengthened, because it is a sound investment in the future of this dynamic country.

I also ask that the following two letters be made a part of my statement before this committee. The first is a letter to the President of the United States from the Honorable Karl F. Rolvaag, Governor, State of Minnesota, urging that he consider the impact on soil and water conservation in Minnesota resulting from the proposed SCS reductions.

The second letter, directed to the President again, from Mr. Alvin Payne, vice chairman of the State of Minnesota Water Resources Board, points out succinctly that conservation is a continuing process, from which benefits may be expected to be realized after many years and for future generations.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you very much for this opportunity to testify in opposition to reductions in soil conservation assistance programs.

MARCH 3, 1965.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have recently been reviewing the proposed cut in funds to the USDA and its impact on soil and water conservation in this State. I am dismayed at this possible reduction in services to the farmers of Minnesota and the hardship it would impose on them. This State is fully exerting itself in a program to conserve its natural resources, specific laws have been enacted to cooperate with the Federal service to achieve a balanced program of soil and water conservation, resource and recreational land use planning. The proposed budget cutback would seriously endanger the programs we have and are planning; the wonderful work that has already been accomplished would wither. I personally feel that rather than curtailing these funds, they should be increased in order that we will have a better land for the people of tomorrow.

Very truly yours,

KARL F. ROLVAAG,
Governor.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
WATER RESOURCES BOARD,
St. Paul, Minn., May 14, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your budget proposals for soil conservation activities, a departure from past practice, now being considered by the 89th Congress, causes us to comment.

The Minnesota Water Resources Board, in its experience of the past decade in establishing State watershed districts within our State, has witnessed the devotion of the soil conservation district supervisors in carrying out their task of motivating fellow landowners to apply to their land soil conservation practices. It has further observed that this group of community leaders are knowledgeable of soil conservation principles, and more than other groups, soundly aware of related resource problems of their community and of this State.

Soil conservation district supervisors performed their duties with the technical support of the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. After a quarter of a century of development, the need for soil and water land use care still remains on much of the Nation's acres. The continued teamwork of a local district governing body and of the above-mentioned Federal agency is still of utmost importance to the public interest of the Nation's urban dwellers, and to the welfare and security of our country.

It appears to us that your proposals of shifting costs of land capital improvements to landowners, will have the effect of killing the existing satisfactory method of placing conservation practices on the land. It must be remembered that the benefits to the landowner from conservation practices applied to the land, do not accrue immediately to the owner, but flow to him over the long run. In recognition of this situation the current governmental program is proper, since there are immediate benefits secured by the public, for its investment as well as a return over the long run.

the answer to which may well determine whether any talks occur at all. Secretary Rusk and the President at times have seemed to be saying that we want a peace under which the Vietcong will simply fold up and go away, leaving South Vietnam as an armed American dependency. The Communists are not going to negotiate any such peace, any more than the United States would in their place. There will have to be major concessions on both sides. In our view, as in Senator Fulbright's, the best hope for a settlement lies in a return to the 1954 Geneva agreements.

This means accepting the military neutralization of North and South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, the ultimate withdrawal of all foreign forces from the whole area, and provisions by which each state can freely decide its own future. It means being prepared to accept an ultimately reunified Vietnam under a Communist, or coalition, or democratic government if that is what the people of both areas decide they want.

The President mentioned the 1954 agreements as a peace aim once, but whether he seriously supports Senator Fulbright's view is not clear. It was the United States, at the prompting of John Foster Dulles, which first violated the spirit of those agreements, and President Johnson would find strong opposition within his own administration to the change of basic policy involved in Senator Fulbright's position. But if the President really wants peace, and really wants self-determination for southeast Asia, he will have to recognize past mistakes and resolve to avoid them.

So also the hard decision will have to be made that it is impossible to arrange a consensus by which his policy wins support both from Americans who want peace in Asia and those who want an expanded war. Republicans in Congress who are beginning to criticize him for failing to aim at total victory will simply have to be told that their policy demands costs and risks which the United States cannot justify. We are confident that the great majority of Americans would overwhelmingly support the President if he leaves it to the Goldwater Republicans to become the war party.

Those Americans who prefer a peace based on the 1954 agreements to hopeless entanglement in an Asian land war must continue to make their feelings unmistakably known. They must conduct a summer offensive of their own to assure the President, their Senators, and their Representatives, that a peace settlement involving major concessions on both sides is the honorable, realistic, and politically stronger objective for American policy.

KEEPING OUR SHIRT ON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Keeping Our Shirt On," written by Ronald Steel, and published in the magazine the New Leader of July 5, 1965. I am pleased to associate myself with the content of the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEPING OUR SHIRT ON

(By Ronald Steel)

The middle of a hurricane may be an inopportune place to call for relaxation, but perhaps it is not a bad idea to do so when there is a tendency to panic. Foundering in the sea of its own ineptitude, the administration is thrashing around desperately in all directions, reacting spasmodically to every wave that breaks over its head and seemingly incapable of making calculated judgments.

From the banks of the Potomac, where crisis diplomacy appears to have become a way of life, the world looks very black indeed.

In Vietnam, as we defend a regime which could not exist 5 minutes without our military support, we are isolated from many of our allies and condemned by virtually everyone else. Our client states in southeast Asia are crumbling, China refuses to be quarantined, the Japanese are restoring their broken ties with the mainland, and India totters on the brink of anarchy. To make matters worse, Peiping's atom bomb eventually will be able to neutralize ours by holding Formosa and the Philippines as hostages.

Nor is the situation much brighter anywhere else. In our own backyard, as we call it, the Alliance for Progress has become a bad joke, Castro is in Cuba to stay, the occupation of Santo Domingo has been a humiliating fiasco, and Latin America seems doomed to a decade of revolution and dictatorship—if not of U.S. occupation. To round out a sorry picture, the U.N. has ceased to furnish an obedient stamp of approval for our actions, demagogues from Egypt to Indonesia tell us to go to hell, NATO is dying on its feet, and an exasperating De Gaulle plucks the fruits of his independent diplomacy in Europe and the churning tiers monde of poor but aspiring states.

No wonder frustrated generals and impatient advisers urge the President to do something to stop this appalling state of affairs. No wonder that they—puzzled by the chasm between our awesome military might and our limited political power over other nations—ponder instant solutions that will somehow solve all our problems once and for all. They are disturbed, even angered, by the fact that the United States, with its atomic arsenal, can neither push its allies into line nor smother revolutions. When faced with stalemate, they strike out with bombs and Marine bridgades to relieve the intolerable sense of frustration. The world is not going the way they would like it and at times like these almost any kind of random activity seems better than sitting tight.

But if we take a few minutes off for a calm look at the world and remove our cold war spectacles, we can see a strange gap between what we think is happening and what is really happening. All our cold war habits tell us that we are engaged in an endless struggle with an international Communist monolith dedicated to our destruction—a struggle to which there can be no limits because the very soul of mankind hangs in the balance. We have been thinking this way ever since the days of the Truman Doctrine in 1947, and—despite everything that has happened in the world since then—we are loathe to think otherwise. It flatters our ego and inspires us with a sense of purpose. Yet for all its familiarity, this is not a very accurate view of the world as it is.

That Communist monolith which used to give us so many sleepless nights has been blasted full of holes as Moscow and Peiping squabble for the mantle of Saint Marx and conduct what looks suspiciously like an old-fashioned power rivalry. The cold war call to arms, with its lurid picture of Cossacks swarming from the Indian Ocean to the English Channel, no longer sets anybody's pulse going. Indeed, how could it at a time when Washington and Moscow are virtually conspiring to keep the lid on the turbulent third world? A beleaguered Berlin, which once threatened to set off a world war, has now all but disappeared from the headlines, and even its wall has been punctured full of doors. The NATO alliance, which was designed to contain Russian aggression in Europe, is falling apart precisely because no one any longer believes such aggression is likely. It has become a victim of its own success, impervious even to the artificial respiration of the MLF applied periodically by an impatient Washington.

For all practical purposes, the cold war in Europe has already been won—by the West. What now remains is the unfinished business of working out an arrangement with Russia for a nuclear-free zone in central Europe and a gradual reunification of the Continent based on the withdrawal of both the Red Army and the U.S. Army. But instead of using the détente to work out a European settlement—one of de Gaulle's objectives, although he doesn't have the power to pull it off—the administration has become so infatuated with the military arrangements of NATO that it cannot contemplate the thought of giving them up.

Even while we congratulate ourselves on our pragmatism, we are still the victims of a cold war mentality. In Latin America, for example, this attitude has led us to transform Fidel Castro from an irritant into a source of torment. By mistaking Fidelismo for an instrument of Russian power rather than recognizing it as a Caribbean caudillismo with a Marxist veneer, we glamorized Fidel, turning him from a small-time demagogue into a symbol of antivandalismo for all Latin America. We made him a hero for those who have little use for his politics but are dazzled by his defiance of us. Most ironical of all, by insisting that Cuba is a Russian satellite, we made it difficult for the Russians to extricate themselves from their foolish over-extension in the Caribbean. We turned Cuba, in short, into the Kremlin's South Vietnam.

We did this because we have not been able to make any real distinction between the half-baked Marxism that animates much of the "third world" and the Russian imperialism that seemed so threatening to Western Europe. This is why we threw ourselves into the tribal warfare of the Congo, why we are fighting a war in behalf of a succession of doomed regimes in Saigon, and why we have virtually invaded Santo Domingo, brandishing, like McCarthy, a list of 55 "Communists," and decreeing our right to combat any insurrection in Latin America which does not suit our standards of propriety.

It is this obsession with labels, this simple-minded assumption that Moscow, or Peiping, or both, must inevitably benefit from any change in the status quo anywhere, that brought the Marines back to the Caribbean and took us into a war against Asians in Vietnam. We have assumed all the obligations of a colonial power without any of its historical justifications or economic benefits. Equating communism with nationalism, we have made Peiping, of all places, seem like the protector of national independence in southeast Asia, and have convinced much of the world that we are simply imperialists trying to replace the French empire with our own.

In this struggle of white men against Asians it is not surprising that the Communist-led Vietcong are considered as patriots in a second anticolonial war—this time against us rather than against the French. In order to win a civil war in the south, we bomb the north. And unless the Saigon regime is saved, we are told, all of Indochina will "go Communist," whatever that means in a Communist world split by feuds.

That is little more than sounding the bell for Pavlov's salivating dog. Most of the nations in the great arc from Pakistan to Korea via Indonesia, like the rest of the "third world," are likely to turn eventually—where they have not already done so—to some variety of authoritarian socialism. They may label it communism or "guided democracy" or any number of phrases designed for maximum public confusion. We can call it communism if we like, but under whatever label it need not be any more hostile to American interests than is a Communist Yugoslavia in central Europe.

If we are trying to immunize Indochina against the Marxist theories in vogue in the

July 7, 1965

15270

ex-colonial world, we are wasting our money, our prestige, and the lives of our soldiers. If, however, we are trying to contain Chinese power, that can only be done by encouraging the creation of strong and independent states in east Asia whatever their political complexion. A Communist Vietnam need not become a party to the quarrels between the Chinese and ourselves. If Ho Chi Minh, with a long record of crafty nationalism, can be a better barrier to Chinese expansion than the revolving generals in Saigon, then more power to him. It would be to our advantage, not to Peiping's, if he were to become, in effect, the Tito of southeast Asia.

But such a prospect is still unthinkable in Washington, where a blood-dripping Chinese dragon has replaced a domesticated Russian bear as the new inspiration for cold war slogans that never die, and rarely even fade away. These slogans, inherited from central Europe in the late 1940's, are about as useful a guide to the mid-1960's as a map of Cincinnati is on the streets of Barcelona. Stumbling around with our old maps and our dark cold war glasses we have not noticed that the postwar world that preoccupied our energies for the past 20 years is now a thing of the past. It has been succeeded by a state of semipermanent revolution throughout the ex-colonial world that neither we nor Russia can control—and which perhaps we would be better off not trying to suppress.

So much of the panic and despair in Washington today is rooted in a vision of the world which for some time has been obsolete. If we can keep our shirt on and make a cold assessment of our real interests, if we can relieve ourselves of an archaic vocabulary, we might discover that the world is surprisingly different from the way we have grown used to describing it.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article concerning the war in Vietnam, written by David L. Graham, and published in the Brunswick, Maine, Record of June 18, 1965. I associate myself with the comments of the article in criticism of the policy of the United States in making war in Asia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE CONTRARY (By David L. Graham)

What is war? Nowadays it is difficult to say.

Americans have died by the hundreds in Vietnam, and thousands more seem likely to join them—skewered on steel, shot to death, blown to bits. But don't call it war. Don't let on to the American people that they are at war. War is too terrible a word.

THIS IS WAR

War conjures up images of homes laid waste and loved ones lost forever, of the wounded screaming with pain and the dead heaped up like garbage. War is not bands playing and the flag to April's breeze unfurled. War, modern war is sudden death from the sky, the stench of burned flesh, and the dust of cities razed to the ground. Modern war is a mutilated child limping through the ruins of its village, a fire-bombed woman twisted in agony.

But nobody says we are at war. Nobody in Washington has declared war. It is just that the American commander in southeast Asia has been given authority to commit his ground forces to battle. By Presidential decision, that is, the Vietnam tragedy has moved into its third and final phase—total war.

The fiction that we are there as trainers and advisers has collapsed totally. Ameri-

can servicemen are there to fight and die. Contributions of aid and braid have proved inadequate. Ambassador Taylor, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, sees hard fighting ahead.

For our troops' sake, let us hope that the former general is as wrong in this as he has been wrong in the past. Like Secretary of Defense McNamara, another sponsor of the Vietnam nightmare, Mr. Taylor's chief contributions to the campaign have been cheery predictions and gross miscalculations. In this way the pair have become President Johnson's most trusted advisers.

In other respects, last week was the week that was. Last week the South Vietnam generals were back in Saigon reshuffling the power. For the ninth time in 2 years the Government collapsed and with it, let us hope, the fiction that American troops are in South Vietnam at the request of its Government. What Government? Take any number from one to nine—only American support has kept them propped up like dummies in the driver's seat. The Vietnamese people have had no more to say about their Government than you or I. American democracy is not for export, either to Vietnam or to the Dominican Republic.

Well, at least we are containing communism, people say, keeping it from spreading across southeast Asia. Do they really think so? Not only are we driving North Vietnam, China, and Russia into an unwilling unity, but the more power we pour into South Vietnam, the stronger grows the Communist Vietcong. They now have 47,000 troops, we estimate, the largest number ever. They now control more than half the country. Recently they have wiped out whole battalions of South Vietnamese troops.

You cannot impose "freedom," least of all upon people who are of an alien culture and a different race. But militarily we were all powerful, we thought, and so we chose to ignore the political and social realities. Our effort to suppress the Vietcong revolution accordingly failed. But instead of learning our lesson and withdrawing, we doubled the stakes. We struck at North Vietnam, whose aid to the Vietcong rebels has been a mere trickle compared with the men and military hardware we have flooded the country with.

When a prudent man's investments go bad, he cuts his losses, gets out. Our loss in Vietnam has been some \$5 billion, but instead of getting out, we doubled our investment, threw good money and good men into a worse gamble; we bombed North Vietnam.

This gamble, too, has now gone sour. Far from "persuading Hanoi that this (war) is a losing proposition," to use Ambassador Taylor's unhappy phrase, our bombing of North Vietnam has only hardened the enemy's will—as anyone but a presidential adviser could have predicted. Slapping a battle-hardened man in the face is no way to crush his spirit.

By our air attacks on a nation without air power, we have lost most of our friends and all but united our enemies. In the larger sense, our bombs have been duds. It is at this point that we have decided to again double the stakes and commit our ground forces to combat. A full-scale war is on and we, the American people, are in it.

DEATH OF MOSHE SHARETT, FORMER PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Moshe Sharett, Israel's first Minister of Foreign Affairs and its second Prime Minister, died today from cancer at the biblical age of 3 score and 10. Since 1960 Mr. Sharett had been chairman of the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency.

Coming to what was then called Palestine from his native Ukraine in 1906, Moshe Sharett grew with his country and helped it grow. He studied in

Tel Aviv, in Istanbul, and at the London School of Economics. He worked as a journalist and as a public servant, serving from 1933 to 1948 as head of the political section of the Jewish Agency.

When Israel gained its independence in 1948, Moshe Sharett became that new nation's first Minister of Foreign Affairs. And when David Ben Gurion stepped down from the post of Prime Minister in 1954, Moshe Sharett succeeded him as his country's second Chief Executive, a post he held until the next year. He then resumed his duties as Foreign Minister until he left that office in 1956.

Mr. Sharett's death marks the passing from the world scene of a battler for his nation's independence and a striver for peace. For many years he was arrayed against Great Britain, the mandatory power in Palestine, but one Israel's independence was gained he had the maturity and statesmanship to work as a friend with Britain for his nation's good. Mr. Sharett symbolizes the revolutionary who, when the aim has been achieved, becomes a great leader of his people. The people of the United States, I feel, join the people of Israel in mourning his passing.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is my hope that Senators who have amendments will offer them. I have discussed a number of amendments with Senators. We would be willing to accept some of those amendments if they would offer them.

We would like to debate some amendments and vote tonight, because we could do that just as well as doing it tomorrow. We might have a long weekend instead of a short weekend, if we could proceed to vote on these amendments.

EARLIER EFFECTIVE DATE OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PAYMENT INCREASES IS IMPERATIVE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the provisions of title IV of House bill 6675 increasing Federal payments under the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act are—although a persuasive case for still greater increases can be made—a small, though significant, step in the direction of more adequate payments. I question, however, the wisdom of delaying the effective date of the increases until January 1, 1966, especially when the effective date of the OASDI increases is retroactive to January 1, 1965. Because of the existence of a means test in the administration of the public assistance programs, retroactive payments would be extremely difficult to administer. A person's means changes from time to time; and it would be hard to go back and figure what a

July 7, 1965

A3593

sincerity * * * it goes beyond mere politeness."

Carlos G. Demarchi, counselor from Argentina: "It means very much to us. Did you know that Hawaii was the first country in the world to recognize the independence of Argentina? King Kamehameha signed a treaty with our country through a captain of an Argentine ship that visited Hawaii in 1816. I would like to stay much longer. I am glad to have the opportunity to learn something about Hawaii in such a short time."

Dr. Solomon B. Asea, Ambassador from Uganda: "It's an island paradise where people go for enjoyment * * *. I have come and found that to be very true. Everything is so exotic * * * the food is exotic, the people are good, climate is good * * * so what else can you ask for? You got everything here."

Emmanuel Y. Agorsor, first secretary from Ghana: "It's a beautiful State. The tropical climate and vegetation reminds me very much of home. I am really impressed by the way people live here, just like we live in my country. People are friendly and very interested in visitors and foreigners. It's different from any other State in the United States in this respect. We all looked forward to Hawaii and we are very happy we came."

Philippe Husson, counselor from France: "Everybody seems so happy and your State is flourishing. It's so full of warmth here. People welcome you in a very charming way. We appreciate this very much. I have intentions of coming back with my wife for a vacation."

Fe O'Donnell Zablocki
Vietnam Background—1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have long contended that the overthrow of President Diem of South Vietnam in late October 1964, was the indirect result of inaccurate and biased reporting by American and other newsmen stationed in Saigon.

The flood of stories alleging police brutality, religious persecution and suppression of liberty by Diem and his regime were, it appears, in large part responsible for the removal of U.S. support and the eventual overthrow and assassination of President Diem and his brother, Nhu.

Additional facts to back up this belief are provided in an article which appears in the July 3 issue of America magazine by the Reverend Patrick O'Connor, the Vietnam correspondent for the National Catholic Welfare Conference. In a well-documented presentation, Father O'Connor points out how unreliable were many of the presumably "factual" stories emanating from Vietnam.

It is his contention that a Buddhist-inspired effort to discredit President Diem succeeded because reporters accepted Buddhist charges without investigation and because they failed to remain objective in a complex and politically charged dispute.

As Father O'Connor says in his article:

The cumulative effect produced by months of reporting by seven or eight journalists was the worldwide impression that a religious persecution of Buddhists by Catholics did indeed exist in South Vietnam.

The falsity of this impression became evident to the special study mission to southeast Asia which I headed in the fall of 1963. This congressional delegation, composed of members of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific, visited Vietnam about a month before Diem's overthrow.

We found—and reported to the Congress—that while certain special privileges were given to all Christian faiths as a holdover from the earlier French rule in Vietnam, religious persecution was not being directed against the Buddhists by the Diem regime.

Our observations were later confirmed by the report of a special United Nations fact finding team which visited Vietnam at the invitation of President Diem to investigate the charges of religious oppression by the Buddhists. This team was in Vietnam at the time of President Diem's assassination, and its report was issued after it was too late to be of help to the wrongly maligned Vietnamese leader.

To lend further credence to the assertions made by Father O'Connor in his article, which I am inserting hereafter in the RECORD, I should like to cite the experience of the study mission regarding the journalists in Saigon.

In an effort to ascertain the truth, our group conducted an "in reverse" press conference to which press correspondents in Vietnam were invited. The purpose of this meeting was to allow them to express their views on the Vietnam situation and air their gripes against the Diem government.

Among those who attended was Father O'Connor, whose news dispatches had differed sharply with other reporters. At my invitation, he recited the facts of the incident at Hue, which began the overt Buddhist campaign, as he knew them. None of the reporters present, including a subsequent Pulitzer Prize winner, offered to refute him. Some of them, however, had filed stories which differed significantly.

Mr. Speaker, the July issue of Ramparts magazine contains an article which contends that a "Vietnam Lobby" exists which promoted Diem into the Presidency of South Vietnam, kept him in power, and swayed the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations into supporting him.

"The Vietnam Lobby" by Robert Scheer and Warren Hinckle is to be recommended to those with a taste for fantasy, for the article can hardly be considered fact. It contains a paucity of documentation, an abundance of sweepingly incorrect judgments and a conspiratorial view of recent history.

Rather than a "Vietnam Lobby," I might suggest a better case could be made for an anti-Diem lobby which would include certain American writers and journalists. Father O'Connor's article raises some questions on that point.

I commend his article which follows, to the attention of my colleagues:

THE DOWNFALL OF THE DIEM GOVERNMENT IN VIETNAM WAS THE RESULT OF A CAMPAIGN TOUCHED OFF BY A NEAR RIOT IN HUE ON MAY 8, 1963—PUBLIC OPINION AND U.S. POLICY WERE INFLUENCED BY REPORTING OF THIS AND SUBSEQUENT EVENTS IN MAJOR NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES—HOW ACCURATE WAS THIS REPORTING?

(By Patrick O'Connor)

Two years ago, a series of events began in South Vietnam that led to the overthrow of its Government on November 1, 1963, and the murder of its President. There followed a prolonged political instability in the country, setbacks in the military resistance to Communist aggression, and a new—to many observers, a more somber—phase in southeast Asian affairs.

In the process that led to the revolution of November 1, press reports of the events between May and November played an extremely influential part. These reports affected public opinion throughout the world, especially in the United States, and thus swayed policy decisions. They encouraged the forces within Vietnam that were working for the Government's overthrow. And they are likely to shape and color the writing of history.

Not all the foreign correspondents resident in or visiting Vietnam in 1963 contributed to the final result. This article will quote a few samples from some of those who did or who, writing soon afterward, manifested what had been a current view in important circles.

The 6-month campaign against the Ngo Dinh Diem government was led in South Vietnam by a section of Buddhists who alleged that they were victims of intolerable religious persecution. The event that set off their campaign was the tragic killing of eight persons in a near riot in Hue on May 8, the feast of Buddha's birthday.

No foreign correspondent was in Hue at the time. Few important happenings can have been so inadequately and so inaccurately reported as this key incident.

On May 6, the Government had telegraphed orders throughout the country that a decree issued and reissued years earlier, restricting the public display of all "international religious flags," should be enforced forthwith. The purpose of the decree was to assert the preeminence of the national flag outside purely religious precincts. Catholics, especially the refugees from the north, had been flying the white-and-yellow Vatican colors on festivals. Since 1950, the organized Buddhists had flown the multicolored flag adopted by the World Buddhist Association.

In some places, the local authorities took their time about applying the order of May 6 as regards Buddhist or Catholic flags. In Hue, the Buddhists had already hung out their flags when, on May 7, the ill-timed order arrived. Naturally, they were unwilling to take them down. The authorities agreed that the order would be suspended until after the festival days. Hence, on the morning of May 8, everybody in Hue was free to fly a Buddhist flag anywhere. The bonzes (Buddhist monks) knew this; they knew also, and apparently had accepted, the restrictions to be put in force later.

Early on May 8, however, Buddhists gathered at Tu Dam pagoda for the birthday celebrations. Banners were displayed denouncing the Government for "injustice" and religious discrimination. Thich ("venerable") Tri Quang, militant organizer of a Buddhist movement in central Vietnam, harangued the crowd, reading out anti-Government slogans and criticizing the admin-

A3594

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 7, 1965

istration. "We are changing this ceremony into a meeting," he announced.

That evening, Buddhists assembled again at Tu Dam for the customary dance of the flowers. The bonzes canceled the observance and told the crowd to march directly to the Government radio station. There they demanded that a tape recording of the morning's speech, with its anti-Government slogans, be broadcast.

A radio official protested that he could not put any speech on the air that had not been authorized in advance. The bonzes persisted. The station director, knowing what was in the recording, telephoned the chief of province, a Buddhist, who ordered him not to broadcast it.

Thich Tri Quang now urged the crowd to stay until the authorities yielded to their demand. They swarmed up to the station and over the porch. Security forces were called out to protect the installation.

Led by a major in a light armored car, soldiers carrying American MK-III concussion (not fragmentation) grenades approached the crowd. Suddenly two powerful explosions took place, in which eight persons, children and women, on the porch were killed. According to expert testimony, MK-III grenades could not have caused the mutilation of bodies or the hole in the pavement that resulted. (The ordinary effect of these grenades, according to the official U.S. field manual, is to cause shock, concussion, or burst eardrums.)

The Government claimed that the tragedy was caused by plastic explosives thrown by the Communist Vietcong. The Buddhists leaders claimed that they had eight martyrs, killed by the Government.

The troops did not fire into the crowd. When the major in charge was put on trial in 1964, the prosecutor never once alleged that they did.

The number of victims, eight, was given to me by Thich Tri Quang himself in Hue later that month. The same number was mentioned by the prosecutor in the trial a year later.

Following are some of the published accounts of the May 8 tragedy in Hue. The first three are from Newsweek:

"Twelve persons were killed in Hue during the Buddhist demonstration protesting an order from President Diem forbidding them to fly their flag on the birthday of Gautama Buddha" (May 27, 1963); "A month earlier, Diem's troops had fired into a Buddhist procession celebrating the 2,507th birthday of the Buddha in Hue, killing 11 people" (July 15); "Diem's troops fired into a Buddhist procession in Hue, killing nine Buddhists who were demanding the right to fly the Buddhist flag" (September 2).

UPI reported (June 2) that Government troops and armored cars "opened fire against thousands of persons protesting against alleged religious discrimination," and a New York Times editorial (June 17) mentioned "the killing of Buddhists by Government troops during a Buddhist ceremony in Hue." Both these sources continued to put the number of those killed at 9; AP put it at 11 even as late as August 23, and again in 1964.

According to Time (Aug. 9): "Government troops forbade Buddhists to unfurl their flags. . . . When the Buddhists protested, the government soldiers stupidly shot down nine demonstrators." As the New Yorker told it (Dec. 14): "Maj. Dang Sy, the Catholic deputy chief of the province, ordered his troops to use live ammunition and grenades and the nine killings took place."

Press reports were apparently the basis for the communication addressed to the U.N. General Assembly by 17 nations, in September, 1963, alleging that "nine persons were killed when troops fired on the participants" in "appropriate [Buddhist] ceremonies" in Hue. The same message asserted Buddhism

is "the faith professed by over 70 percent" of the Vietnamese.

No national religious census has ever been taken in Vietnam. Responsible Vietnamese and foreign observers have estimated the percentage of practicing Buddhists in the population at something between 20 and 30. Some would put it under 20. During 1963, however, foreign correspondents gave these varied, unsubstantiated figures for the percentage of Buddhists: "about 90" (Associated Press, May 13), "about 80" (Associated Press, May 29); "about 75" (New York Times, June 5), "70" (New York Times, July 28); "80" (Time, June 14); "about 80" (United Press International, July 1), "more than 80" (United Press International, July 30).

A remarkable myth has been accepted and propagated in press reports regarding the episcopal silver jubilee of Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc of Hue, brother of the late President Diem. According to an article in The Reporter (Sept. 12, 1963):

"During the first week of May, Catholics of Hue had decorated the city with crosses, Vatican flags and large pictures of Archbishop Thuc to celebrate the 25th anniversary of his ordination as bishop. These ceremonies ended on Sunday, May 5 On the night of May 6, while the city streets were still festooned with Thuc's picture, a telegram from the presidency in Saigon ordered enforcement of a regulation that only the national flag should be flown during religious ceremonies. . . . The Catholic decorations remained on the bridge across the Perfumed River. . . . The Buddhists, carrying defiant banners, crossed the river in sampans."

Readers of the New Yorker (Dec. 14, 1963) were told:

"The commemoration of the 2,507th anniversary of the Buddha's birth . . . happened to overlap [a celebration] commemorating the 25th anniversary of Archbishop Thuc's consecration as bishop. The trouble had begun when Thich Tri Quang, the Buddhist leader of central Vietnam, refused to send Thuc a congratulatory telegram. The Government thereupon gave orders for strict enforcement of a 2-year-old ban against the flying of religious flags, despite the fact that during Thuc's celebration the Vatican flag was displayed along with the national flag and Thuc's picture appeared all over Hue. The Buddhists defiantly began to display their own banners 3 days before the Buddha's birthday, on May 8, while the Catholic flags and pictures were still up."

This is untrue. Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc did not celebrate his silver jubilee in Hue until June 28-29. The record shows that he was in Qui Nhon on April 30, in Danang on May 1, in Dalat May 3-4 and in Saigon May 5-6. He did not allow the public flying of the Vatican flag. In August 1962, he ordered the Redemptorists to take down the papal flags hoisted outside their new church in preparation for the dedication ceremony. After that time, no Vatican flags were flown publicly in Hue.

Where did the untrue story originate? At least one of the journalists quoted got it from an American official in Saigon, a man who had not been in Hue on May 8. It looks as if some partisan informant hoodwinked the U.S. Embassy in Saigon or the consulate in Hue, or both.

Another fiction, perhaps from the same source, was apparently accepted by American officials in Hue after the August 21 raid on the pagodas and passed on to the New York Times and United Press International. On August 23, the Times said:

"Despite Government reports that no one was killed in the attack on the Buddhists, diplomatic sources reported from Hue that nearly 100 priests, students, and Boy Scouts were killed or wounded during the attack on Tu Dam pagoda. At least 30 persons were reported to have been killed there."

United Press International said much the same thing on August 23: "Diplomatic sources, citing latest reports from Hue, said some 100 Buddhists were killed or wounded when Government troops stormed the main Tu Dam pagoda there Wednesday. Sources said that of this number they believe at least 30 Buddhists were killed."

In November, after the overthrow of the Diem government, the Buddhist bonzes in Tu Dam stated definitely that nobody had been killed in the August 21 raid on their pagoda.

A similar attack was reported in Saigon. Associated Press from Tokyo (August 23), quoting Saigon, said: "At least 1 monk was reported killed and 30 monks and nuns wounded in the midnight raid on Saigon's Xa Loi pagoda." Months later the bonze spokesman in Xa Loi pagoda told me that nobody had been killed there.

The story that bonzes had been killed in Hue or Saigon was apparently flashed immediately to Washington and believed there. An Associated Press story of August 21 from Washington declared: "Official sources said the crackdown included hundreds of arrests, the seizing of important pagodas and killing of some monks."

Newsweek next reported (September 2): "Some 2,000 pagodas were raided. At least 30 Buddhists are said to have lost their lives." The truth is that about a dozen pagodas were raided, in Saigon, Hue and a few other towns. Most of the thousands of pagodas in the country were left untouched. Newsweek also stated: "The troops in Operation Pagoda had three dominant characteristics: 'They were Catholic, they were from Hue, and they were ruthless.'" On inquiry, the basis for this proved to be a remark reportedly made by a non-Catholic Vietnamese officer about a handful of men, less than a squad, at one pagoda.

A New York Times story of August 23 said: "Two of [Col. Le Quang Tung's] battalions are reported to be 'Catholic battalions.'" Colonel Tung, murdered in the general staff headquarters on November 1, commanded the Vietnamese Special Forces. An article in Esquire (January 1964) echoed the Times, saying: "Two of Colonel Tung's battalions, which carried out the pagoda raids, were so-called 'Catholic battalions.'" Who called them that, we are not told. I myself was told, however, by two U.S. officers, advisers with the Vietnamese Special Forces, that there were no Catholic battalions. Furthermore, I was told by American and Vietnamese sources that the men who actually entered the pagodas in Saigon were not from the special forces.

On September 2, Newsweek said: "Even more seriously, fighting was reported to have broken out between Catholic and Buddhist troops in Dinh Tuong. Sixty soldiers were reported to have been killed and 120 wounded." Times picked up the same canard (August 30): "At week's end, according to one report . . . at the small town of My Tho . . . Buddhist and Catholic troops turned on each other." Exhaustive inquiries from military and civilian sources proved this story to be entire untrue. It was released by Reuters and by United Press International, which, however, speedily tried to have it killed.

Early in the Buddhist campaign, the foreign press made sweeping allegations such as the following: "The South Vietnam Government . . . is made up chiefly of Roman Catholics" (Associated Press, May 13); "Most of Ngo Dinh Diem's high Government officials, chiefs of provinces and military officers are Catholics" (Newsweek, May 27); "Most high Government officials, chiefs of provinces, and military officers are Catholics" (New York Times editorial, June 17); "Diem and his principal Government officials are Roman Catholics" (United Press International, July 8).

July 7, 1965

A3595

It came as a surprise to some of the press corps to learn that only 3 of the 19 Vietnamese generals of that time (and only 1 of the 4 corps commanders) and 5 of the 17 Cabinet ministers were Catholics.

On July 15, an Associated Press release said: "Newspapers also reported the promotion of Col. Do Cao Tri, a Roman Catholic, to the rank of brigadier general, apparently as the first step toward assuring command of an area that will include the Buddhist holy city of Hue." Do Cao Tri is not a Catholic. It would be a glaring exaggeration to imply that Hue can be called a Buddhist holy city in the sense that Jerusalem or Rome or Mecca is a holy city.

According to an article in the Washington Post (June 23): "Among South Vietnam's private schools, Catholic-run institutions receive Government subsidies; Buddhist-run institutions do not." Less than 4 percent of Vietnam's private secondary schools, Catholic and other, and less than 1 percent of private primary schools, received any Government aid at all.

The total amount given to all was minimal, less than \$6,500 for the year. The chairman of the allocations committee in 1963 was a Buddhist. Most of the 29 schools receiving grants were indeed Catholic-run, some of them serving poor refugees. The only private school receiving a Government grant in the Saigon-Cholon area was one conducted by a Buddhist bonzes. Buddhist schools were few, simply because Buddhists have not made much effort in the field of general education. Two semipublic schools, purely for Buddhist studies, received a total of more than \$6,000 (451,000 piastres) from Government funds in 1962.

The Washington Post article stated, further: "Catholic priests are the rectors at the predominantly Buddhist universities at Hue and Dalat." The university in Hue is a state institution. The rector was a Vietnamese priest-scholar whom the Diem government dismissed in August 1963. Under him there were four administrative bureaus in the university, each of them headed by a non-Catholic. Of 30 persons employed in the university administration, only 5 were Catholics. The University of Dalat is a Catholic institution. The same article states: "Only 2 of the 16 Cabinet members are Buddhists." According to my information, the Cabinet had 17 members. If only 2 of the 12 non-Christians were Buddhists, that merely illustrates the inaccuracy of the estimate, repeated by the writer, that Buddhists form 70 to 80 percent of the population.

Throughout the 6 months before the coup, many foreign journalists showed an almost obsessive preoccupation with President Ngo Dinh Diem's religion. They harped on it day after day and transferred his religious affiliation to the Government. "The Roman Catholic government of President Diem" (Washington Post editorial, June 11); "Diem's Catholic government" (Newsweek, June 24; Associated Press, Washington, July 11); "Catholic President Ngo Dinh Diem's government" (United Press International, June 9, 16; August 18)—these were typical word-groupings. In a single story, Reuters (June 13) spoke of the "Roman Catholic-led government," the "5-week-old religious crisis" and "Catholic President Ngo Dinh Diem."

It has been claimed that the correspondents in general, and the New York Times in particular, always declared that the dispute was political under a religious banner. One did indeed find such statements as these: "Slowly the entire matter has become more political than religious. In its larger context the crisis is basically political" (New York Times, June 16); "politico-religious crisis" (United Press International, June 1), "The Buddhist campaign has become more political and now is seen as being predomi-

nantly so" (United Press International, July 28). On June 7, Associated Press said cautiously: "Leading Catholic priests say the matter is political, not religious."

On the other hand, phrases and statements appeared that gave ordinary readers across the world the impression that the issue was one of religious persecution. Here are a few examples from the New York Times: "religious conflict" (June 5), "the current religious dispute" (June 11), "bitter religious crisis" (June 14), "5-week-old religious crisis" (June 16), "controversy between the Buddhists and the Government, which is Roman Catholic" (July 21).

From other sources: "the current religious dispute between militant Buddhists and the Catholic-led government" (Reuters, June 10); "The Government is deep in a freedom of religion conflict with Vietnam's Buddhists" (United Press International, July 9), "South Vietnam's 10-week-old crisis over religious freedom" (United Press International, July 23), "the Government's moves in crushing the Buddhists' religious movement" (United Press International, August 25); "religious conflict between President Ngo Dinh Diem, a Roman Catholic, and Buddhist leaders" (Associated Press, July 15); "The U.S.-backed regime, which launched a wave of terror against Buddhists" (Newsweek caption, September 2).

Correspondents, it is true, usually took the routine precaution of saying "alleged" when they wrote of "persecution" or "discrimination." However protective this word might have been for the writer in a court of law, it did not keep the reading public from being misled. The cumulative effect produced by months of reporting by seven or eight journalists was the worldwide impression that a religious persecution of Buddhists by Catholics did indeed exist in South Vietnam.

Correspondents who reported the political Buddhists' allegations throughout 6 months did not take the time or trouble to investigate them carefully. They left their readers with reiterated allegations and vivid descriptions of carefully staged protests, but without the hard, precise information by which the allegations could be judged.

There were also notable oversights. In June 1963, the Government issued a detailed report that listed, province by province, the pagodas newly built or restored since Ngo Dinh Diem had come to power 9 years earlier. More than one-fourth of the country's 4,766 pagodas had been constructed in that period, and more than one-fourth repaired. The report showed that the Government had given money grants totaling more than 8 million piastres and hundreds of hectares of land for pagodas. It itemized the amounts, locations, and pagodas. I did not see these facts reported by the Associated Press, the United Press International, the New York Times, Newsweek, or Time.

Rarely did any correspondent mention that Vice President Nguyen Ngoc Tho, chief representative of the President in negotiating with the Buddhist leaders, was himself a Buddhist, or that two of the Government's three-man Interministerial Committee were non-Christians.

Sometime in June, a Buddhist bonze told correspondents that his leaders' "five demands" were not the real issue now and that the intention was to bring about the overthrow of the government. This, as far as I know, was not revealed at the time in the dispatches of the journalists concerned.

A certain number of errors and omissions are always to be expected in news stories written in a foreign land, and under the constant stress of having to meet a deadline. It is noteworthy, however, that in Vietnam in 1963 the errors and omissions usually tended to favor the Buddhist agitation against the government.

Efforts were indeed made to correct popular

misconceptions. Time, which occasionally erred, said on August 9: "Since he took over the government in 1954, Diem has gone to great lengths not to offend the Buddhist majority * * *. Whenever there is a whisper of opposition, the government treats Catholics like anyone else." On October 18, it said: "Even Diem's severest critics in Saigon concede that there was no serious religious persecution until the present troubles began, and that the Buddhist movement has become a political force dedicated to Diem's overthrow."

It is not within the scope of this report to quote from correspondents who disagreed with those I have quoted.

Finally, a note of social and even gastronomic interest may be added. About 3 weeks after the coup d'etat of November 1, the foreign correspondents in Saigon—with some exceptions—were invited by the Buddhist bonzes, as a mark of appreciation, to a dinner. It was given in the premises of Xa Loi pagoda, which had been the bonzes' command post during most of their campaign. The guests were greeted by girl members of Buddhist Youth, who pinned on each a yellow Buddhist ribbon. The nine-course dinner—vegetarian, to be sure—was enjoyed in the jubilant atmosphere of a victory celebration.

Protecting American Patents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in recent years several vital segments of American industry have suffered severe revenue losses as a result of Government purchases of foreign products manufactured from stolen U.S. patents. Most seriously affected have been the pharmaceutical, chemical, and electronic industries, which are heavily concentrated in New Jersey. This unfair competition is jeopardizing the jobs of American workers and discouraging our American firms from continuing the expensive investment in essential research and development of new products.

To eliminate this unfair situation, I have introduced in the House H.R. 5675, which would prohibit Government purchases of any products manufactured from pirated patents. An identical bill introduced by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, S. 1047, is now the subject of hearings in the Senate. I am glad to say that labor and management are united in support of this essential legislation, and I, under unanimous consent, include the text of a resolution adopted by the New Jersey State AFL-CIO convention on the legislation in the RECORD.

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF FULL PATENT PROTECTION TO SAVE JOBS IN AMERICAN INDUSTRY

Whereas 1965 marks the 175th anniversary of the first patent law in the United States; and

Whereas through a technicality in the statutes covering patent law protection, certain Government agencies have assumed the right to bypass patent laws in the purchase of products from foreign countries which do not respect American patent laws; and

Whereas such loopholes in the law have resulted in the purchase of many millions of

July 7, 1965

A3596

dollars of such foreign products, which are manufactured under cheap labor conditions and manufactured under formulas stolen, copied and otherwise infringing on American patents; and

Whereas in the pharmaceutical, chemical, and electronic industries such stolen patents and other infringements of American patents have resulted in the loss of thousands of American jobs and have adversely affected the livelihood of nearly 5 million workers in organized labor; and

Whereas such practices threaten the very incentives for research and manufacture which have kept America in the forefront of industrial and medical developments; and

Whereas U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Congressman PETER W. RODINO, Jr., of New Jersey, have introduced identical bills in Congress aimed at insuring full and adequate protection in safeguarding employment opportunities for American workers under our patent laws; be it hereby

Resolved, That the New Jersey State AFL-CIO in convention voice support for Senator WILLIAMS' bill S. 1047 and Congressman RODINO's bill H.R. 5675, being identical measures designed to protect and strengthen the American patent system by insuring that no Government agency be permitted to purchase products manufactured abroad through stolen or infringed American patents; and be it further

Resolved, That the New Jersey State AFL-CIO bodies to adopt identical resolutions in the interest of the American labor movement and in preservation of American jobs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary-treasurer of the New Jersey State AFL-CIO to the national AFL-CIO with a recommendation that the S. 1047 and H.R. 5675 be made part of the legislative policy of the AFL-CIO for adoption by the Congress of the United States, and with the request that this resolution be submitted to the 1965 national convention of the AFL-CIO for its support and adoption.

Wanton Cruelty and Terrorism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, in much of our public discussion of the crisis in Vietnam, there is overlooked the organized terrorism that is the hallmark of Vietcong tactics. Those advocates of withdrawal from Vietnam who condemn American policy through rationalizations that depict the Vietcong as patriotic revolutionaries seeking to liberate their country conveniently ignore the barbaric savagery of the Vietcong. Their violence is not limited to the battlefield nor is it directed principally against the military forces of the Republic of Vietnam, but rather through stealth and assassination, it seeks to intimidate and immobilize the civilian populace of South Vietnam through unparalleled acts of terror.

Because the following editorial from the Northern Virginia Daily, published at Strasburg, Va., July 6, 1965, puts the nature of the Vietcong tactics in proper perspective, I should like to insert it in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of other Members of the House.

ASSURANCE ENOUGH

If anyone requires further proof of the wanton disregard of all principles of morality by the Vietcong terrorists, they need only recognize the execution of U.S. Army Sgt. Harold George Bennett for what it is: an outrageous denial of the prisoner-of-war standards accepted by civilized peoples.

They are in effect, saying, "This is what we believe."

When the bombs exploded in the Saigon restaurant—hardly a military objective, which the Hanoi radio proudly confirmed—killing and wounding more than a hundred men, women, and children, they told us again, "This is what we believe."

Behind that simple statement and the two latest acts of savagery lies the inescapable and deadly truth about the enemy in Vietnam. They hold nothing sacred except the will to win.

We have met this breed before.

Certainly we'll be hearing from the self-appointed get-out-of-Vietnam magistrates that these are only acts of desperate men eager for self-government. Their thinking has as much reasoning behind it as the statements of justifiable revenge coming from Hanoi.

We've had assurance enough just what kind of government the South Vietnamese would be forced to endure under the direction of the Red comrades.

A Look Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, at this time of the year, when there are many graduations being held, I was pleased to find a valedictory address, given in my congressional district, which I feel is worthy of particular note. Miss Peggy Paciotti, of Pacific High School in San Leandro, Calif., had great wisdom in the excellent speech which she gave on behalf of her class, entitled "A Look Ahead." I am pleased to insert her remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CURRIER'S COMMENTS

(By Win Currier)

A copy of the valedictory address delivered by Peggy Paciotti at the commencement exercises of Pacific High School has been forwarded to us and it is worthy of publication.

A notation accompanying the copy of the address says that "it breaks tradition for such speakers by saying something."

We are not expert in the field to the extent that we can compare it with other valedictory addresses that were given at the various schools this month, but there is no doubt that this one does say something significant.

Her address follows:

"A LOOK AHEAD"

"The end of an era marks the beginning of a new one, and this new one is the era of our involvement. It's the time when we emerge from childhood's protective shell of dependency and become a determining part of this society, this world, this history that's being recorded, this future that's being created. We begin this era with an affirma-

tion of personal independence and freedom, for we believe that rightness is inherent in individuality. With confidence in ourselves and each other, we willingly accept the consequences of our decisions.

"We are aware of the greatness of our Nation: Our political heritage of democracy and freedom, our opportunities for personal advancement. We appreciate our educational advantages. And we do want the material gains that our society is so famous for.

"But at the same time, we see that the happiness that should follow our Nation's material wealth is not there as it should be. For even the most rich there is no limit, no end, to the desire for the things that money can buy. And as for the poor, the pursuit of even the necessities of life often goes unrewarded. Most of us, as a people, are addicted to the formula that money and success are the same, many of us to the idea that the main purpose in life is to improve social status.

"The pettiness of our desires is made even more apparent when we look outside our country. The UNESCO Courier of June 1964 tells us that for each of us who inherits a life of comfort, two inherit a life of want, and these two will spend their lives usually sick and always close to starvation. Two out of three may never know what clean water looks or tastes like. And now, with the improvements in communications, these people who always were poor, for the first time feel poor.

"This, too, is the world we inherit.

"But here, within our land, where we live in prosperity? We know that when men become slaves to their desires for material possessions, when people become less important than things, when the dignity and worth of any man is questioned or threatened, we must be ready to sacrifice the security of feeling better off than someone else and adopt the security of living as important and unique individuals.

"This is expressed in two lines of a Zen poem:

"In the landscape of spring, there is neither high nor low. The flowering branches grow naturally, some long, some short.

"In other words, by the design of nature the long branch is no more important than the short branch, no more able to exist alone than the tides independent of the moon. And so with men.

"We can never submit to the cruel assumption that people with certain admirable assets are necessarily the most important people or are to be envied. Yes, we admit that some people have richer parents, some people are more beautiful, some more talented, intelligent, some more highly educated or trained. But we can never form judgments about who is most important or who worth most admiration. We cannot do it, because it destroys us, as individuals, as a community, and as a nation. It destroys every man who can't give his family the material abundances so idolized by his society. It destroys every artist, thinker, or person whose thoughts flow contrary to public opinion and who has consequently been crushed. It destroys the community where the haves compete, at the expense of the have nots. And it destroys the nation that congratulates itself on a reputation for affluence when there remains in that nation a certain number of disillusioned, isolated, alienated, and very poor persons—born to lose.

"So, we dare to believe in the natural diversity of human character. We believe in achieving levels of understanding which melt into tolerance, in defeating any propaganda which tries to dictate what is success and what is failure in our land. And as a final aspiration, we believe in a softening of preconceived and superimposed dictates a good and bad, right and wrong.

"A nation of men and women thus dedicated to the concept of the uniqueness and

July 7, 1965

A3597

worth of every man, cannot fall itself, or its foreign neighbors, or the future generations of mankind."

Project HOPE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Flushing, N.Y., Queens Voice pays tribute to the many busy executives who take time out from their important tasks to work without pay for worthwhile organizations like Project HOPE.

In the article by Jackie Robinson, we learn that such men as Jerome S. Hardy, publisher of Life magazine, and Paul Felix Warburg, a noted investment banker, serve HOPE unselfishly as members of the national HOPE board of directors.

Mr. Robinson appropriately salutes the men from industry, labor, and all walks of life who, with medical people such as Dr. William B. Walsh, founder and president of Project HOPE, devote their skills to humanitarian ideals.

The column by Jackie Robinson follows:

JACKIE ROBINSON SAYS
(By Jackie Robinson)

In the welter of anguished headlines about racial strife and the ugly reflections of the inhumanity of our times, we often fail to note the powerful, quiet programs which are being conducted to advance the march of humanity.

Such a project is called to our attention by Jerome S. Hardy, an erstwhile golf partner, who is sacrificing a great deal of time and energy to discharge his duties as the chairman of the New York committee of a magnificently humane program called Project HOPE.

Hope is a hospital ship which carries around the world—to hundreds of thousands in Asia, South America, and Africa—the best America can offer in medical services and people who teach professional counterparts in developing nations. The latter, in turn, pass on the information and skills to younger people of their own countries.

Dr. William B. Walsh organized HOPE in 1958. On its maiden voyage to Indonesia in 1960, 200 doctors and 300 nurses were given special training; 18,000 patients were treated and 700 operations performed. Thousands of people were X-rayed and examined. In 1961, in South Vietnam, 500 major operations were performed. Then, in 1963 HOPE moved in on the Latin American front. During 10 months in Peru, 80,000 persons were directly aided by HOPE services—and several hundred thousand South Americans were helped indirectly.

Now, HOPE has sent medical teams to Africa, while continuing to work in Saigon, Trujillo, and Ecuador.

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, commenting on the work accomplished by this project, has said: "There is only one thing wrong with Project HOPE; namely, that it consists of only one ship. We need many more like it. It behooves all Americans to pitch in and help support the magnificent work of this floating American medical center with their financial contributions."

Paul Felix Warburg, board member of the project, just recently returned from Conakry, Guinea, in Africa, where the good ship Hope is currently docked. Here is his reaction to what he observed:

"To see our doctors and nurses in action, working with their Guinean counterparts, is something I will never forget. The impact on the people of backward nations—such as Guinea—makes one realize that the good ship Hope means in good will between the people of foreign lands and our country."

Dr. Walsh, Jerome Hardy, and all the other humanitarian Americans who are helping to wage peace by the concern for basic, humanitarian needs, are heroes in the ever-increasing struggle to emphasize those things which unite the peoples of the world, instead of the considerations which divide them.

The 20th Anniversary of the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this body today on the topic of the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations. Today, more than ever, we see the critical importance of this international body as the development of nuclear weaponry proliferates. We see how the complexion of international diplomacy has changed since the time when the German strategist von Clausewitz stated that war is but an extension of diplomacy.

The United Nations has served a vital function during the years since it was set up at the Dumbarton Conference following World War II. It has sent peace forces into Korea, Yemen, the Congo (Léopoldville) and the Sinai Peninsula. Currently, the United Nations is maintaining a precarious peace in Cyprus between the Turkish and Greek communities. These forces have been able to take the heat out of strained situations and give nations some time to cool off before bringing them to the conference table.

In the field of technical and economic assistance, the United Nations has perhaps served its most vital role. By giving help and advice to the developing nations, the United Nations has helped to make these states more economically viable. The work of Paul Hoffman, Managing Director of the Special Fund, has been invaluable in this regard and is worthy of the greatest praise. The Economic and Social Council, the Food and Agriculture Organization and the regional economic organizations of the United Nations have been the sustaining framework for the poorer nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, today the weaponry of this world includes not only arrows and axes and gunpowder but also the hydrogen bomb. We have enough weapons today for the first time in history to eradicate human life on this planet. The question thus becomes not one of the need for a United Nations but how to increase its effectiveness.

Only through a worldwide effort can we ever hope to avoid the ultimate holocaust. If in 1995 we do not celebrate the 50th anniversary of the birth of the United Nations, it is highly likely that there will not be anyone left to celebrate anything on earth.

Fe (Om) Zablocki
Vietnam Background—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of America magazine featured three articles under the single title "Vietnam Background." I previously have inserted an article by the Reverend Patrick O'Connor on alleged persecution of Buddhists by the Diem regime.

At this point I would like to insert a second article from "Vietnam Background." This one is by Prof. Quentin L. Quade, of the political science department at Marquette University, Milwaukee.

In his article, Professor Quade calls for a clearer articulation of policy on Vietnam, as a means of answering those who have criticized U.S. actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

While I do not completely agree with Professor Quade that the administration can or should make explicit the scope for our current policy, his conclusions about the underlying theme of that policy are valid ones and deserve careful consideration.

For that reason I urge the attention of my colleagues to the article, which appears hereafter:

VIETNAM BACKGROUND
(By Quentin L. Quade)

(NOTE.—What is the aim of American foreign policy? How many Vietnams and Dominican Republics must we be prepared to police? These questions are being repeatedly asked by the critics of the administration's foreign policy. Although the answers to them are implicit in that policy, they have not as yet been clearly articulated—and they must be.)

Faced with massive, if often incoherent, criticism of its policy in Vietnam, the administration has gone a considerable distance toward explaining that policy. The President, Secretaries Rusk and McNamara, and other spokesmen have devoted themselves more and more to the root question of why the United States is involved in this remote place. In attempting to give an answer, these men have elaborated three interrelated themes that seem to constitute the premises of our Vietnam policy.

The first premise is that the world is integral, and that the struggle in Vietnam is simply part of the wider conflict with the forces of aggression. In President Johnson's words: "This is the same battle we have fought for a generation." The second premise is really a lesson drawn from experience. It argues that the modern aggressor's appetite is insatiable and cannot be appeased. As the President has declared: "Wherever we have stood firm, aggression has been halted, peace restored, and liberty maintained." And Secretary Rusk affirms

July 7, 1965

A3598

this judgment: "We are told that southeast Asia is far away—but so were Manchuria and Ethiopia." The third premise, which inevitably colors the first two, is an appraisal of the character of contemporary communism. This judgment is perhaps best expressed by Dean Rusk, who, while acknowledging conflict between China and the Soviet Union, nonetheless insists that both are "committed to the eventual communization of the entire world."

Taken together, these three prudential judgments represent a rationale or theory of U.S. action in Vietnam. This rationale and the judgments on which it is based are rejected by some (Walter Lippmann) as being substantively incorrect. But it is possible to share and support the administration's theory and its premises, and still be seriously dissatisfied with it—not because it is wrong, but because it is insufficient. For in one crucial respect the position of the administration, as enunciated to date, is warning: it seems to have no "resolution dimension," no end in sight.

This fact helps to explain the abundance of criticism directed at the policy. Dean Rusk has called for sense not nonsense from opinion leaders in the country, but he and his colleagues are at least partly responsible for the incoherence of much of the criticism, simply because the administration has failed to provide a final rationale of its policy. What is the end of U.S. policy in Vietnam? How long will it continue, and how often will it be repeated? Walter Lippmann undoubtedly speaks for many when he says: "The addicts of the global and crusading theory should ask themselves how many more Vietnams and Dominican Republics they are prepared and able to police."

There is implicit in present American policy an answer to these questions, but it has not as yet been articulated. Its articulation requires an appraisal of human nature, and a testing of the universality of that nature. It requires the kind of probing done by Pope John XXIII in "Pacem in Terris."

The most fundamental objectives of American foreign policy is to achieve and maintain conditions of relative peace and order around the world. A part of this objective is to enable the various peoples of the world to define their own political order freely. This policy is presented as an accurate reflection, first, of what our own national security requires, and second, of the best condition for all men.

Applied to Vietnam, this general policy is specified roughly as follows: South Vietnam is an independent state whose political integrity is presently threatened by attempts to impose a regime upon it. The threat is in several forms: Vietcong guerrillas are waging a form of civil war, but this is more than simple internal dissension, because the Vietcong are representative of an international conspiracy; as such, they are receiving substantial support from outside South Vietnam. In this context, there is direct involvement of North Vietnam, and indirect involvement of China and the Soviet Union. Thus, against the background of our basic foreign policy, the defense of South Vietnam is important in itself. But it is also important in a larger sense: it is a direct confrontation between us and the Communist powers.

In this sense, any integral American policy in Vietnam must have at its root an assessment of the character of communism today, including the possibility of differentiating among the several brands now available. In terms of its international ramifications, which are most pertinent here, communism is a world view that gives its adherents certain conceptual categories that serve as operative motives or dynamics in international politics. More precisely, it is a doctrine of combat that sees the world divided between imperialists and the oppressed. According to the doctrine, this division of the world necessarily

results in conflict, which conflict will ultimately be decided in favor of the international proletariat, i.e., the Communist regimes as self-defined representatives of the proletariat.

What is to be said of this doctrine, and how is the United States to respond to it? The first point—and, though it may seem a truism, the most important—is that the doctrine is erroneous; it does not genuinely portray the realities of international life. (This is not to say, of course, that Marxism-Leninism, and particularly the creed of Lenin's "Imperialism," has no pertinence to past and present world politics. But Communists propound this doctrine as the total explanation, and this, clearly, it is not.)

But despite the error at its basis, in nearly a half-century communism has worked rather substantially, and has expanded from areas proximate to St. Petersburg and Moscow until today it commands one-third of the world. And to the extent that it has worked, to its proponents it seems true. This phenomenon of error confirmed by success is not uncommon, and the notion of self-fulfilling prophecy is particularly pertinent to communism. Since Lenin, its leaders have stated that such-and-such would happen, and have then gone out and made it happen.

If this analysis of international communism is correct, what are its implications for U.S. policy? Since the U.S. basic objective in foreign policy is to achieve and maintain relative world order, it is obliged to neutralize the aggressive and disruptive tendencies of the Communist countries, which are presently the primary—though certainly not the exclusive—source of world disorder. To achieve a neutralization of Communist aggressiveness, the United States must blunt and deter every instance of Communist expansionism, whether it be in Berlin, Korea, Vietnam, or elsewhere.

But this is where Lippmann's question becomes pertinent and where, I suggest, the rationale of the administration's policy is deficient: Is this confrontation with communism to continue indefinitely, perhaps in perpetuity? Are we to anticipate an unending series of Vietnams in the future, each of which will present the awful possibility of the holocaust? Is our present policy tenable if it has no prospect but repetition of itself?

This need not, however, be the prospect of our present policy. The ultimate justification of the policy is that if, over an extended period of time, we consistently frustrate each Communist effort at expansion, we will force the Communists to reassess the validity of their doctrine in its international dimensions and, one may hope, abandon it in practice.

Emphasis on this principle, I think, can make our present policy integral; hence it is essential to clarify the elements of the assertion. First, it affirms the possibility of fundamental change in the Communist countries, especially regarding their attitudes in international politics, and this avoids the danger of freezing our perceptions of communism, a danger eloquently cited in *Pacem in Terris*. And this is just another way of saying that before Communist leaders are Communists, they are men; in them is a human nature that can guide them out of the paths of aggression and into the paths of rational accommodation and adjustment. But to the extent the Communist leaders are able to fulfill their erroneous prophecies, they will not follow the dictates of humanness. This country must therefore speed and facilitate that reassertion of human nature in the Communist regimes by demonstrating in the concrete order the error of their theory.

In this regard, it may not be premature to suggest that we are witnessing the beginning of such a transformation in the Soviet Union. Though it remains essen-

tially totalitarian in its internal makeup, it has been increasingly reluctant to heighten international tensions. Why? Perhaps in part, at least, because its expansionistic efforts in its natural areas—Europe—have been quite definitely rebuffed. Is it inconceivable to anticipate a similar transformation in the Chinese attitude, if we can successfully deter them?

What does this mean for our policy in Vietnam? We are, it seems to me, obliged to deter and finally discourage Communist aggression there, be it Vietcong, North Vietnamese, Chinese or Soviet. Implicit in this judgment is the willingness to escalate the conflict as high as necessary to achieve the objective of negotiations on the basis of guarantees of South Vietnamese integrity. Escalation "as high as necessary" is loaded with frightening possibilities, of course, but the alternative is even more frightening. To set a self-imposed limit on our escalation would be comparable to telling an opposing poker player that you would only bet so high and then drop out. Equally important, we must be prepared to continue the conflict so long as is necessary, expecting that our huge economic superiority translated into military stamina will cause our adversaries to reach a point where they judge the price of aggression too high.

And finally—Walter Lippmann's question can now be answered—we must be prepared to repeat this performance in response to every instance of Communist expansionism, on the judgment that there is a genuine end in view.

Repeal of Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, for the recent repeal of manufacturers' excise taxes to have their maximum effect, they should be passed on to the consumer. I am happy to note that this is the view taken by a distinguished member of the New York business community who has indicated that his company plans to pass on the tax savings in a price reduction.

Mr. Speaker, under permission I insert in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Henry Steinway of the famous piano making firm of the same name which indicates a policy that I hope will be followed by American business generally:

STEINWAY & SONS,
July 2, 1965.

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: A few months ago I wrote you about our interest in excise tax repeal and you were good enough to reply, expressing your interest in this matter. I would just like to thank you for your support of this measure which repealed this tax that has discriminated against pianos and other musical instruments since 1941.

For your information, we, Steinway & Sons, have immediately reduced our wholesale price to our dealers by the total amount of the tax and have reduced our suggested retail price by the amount of the tax, together with the normal markup on this tax. In this way we are passing on the maximum benefits to the public as we believe this was the intention of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY Z. STEINWAY,
President.